

REMARKS**OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION**

In a Final Office Action dated July 16, 2007, the Examiner has withdrawn a prior rejection of Claims 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. §101, but now objects to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed “electronically accessible medium” recited in Claim 25 as filed and as presently presented. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s conclusion, and directs his attention to paragraph [0068] of the specification, which describes an electronically accessible medium, namely memory, and explains that memory

may also include one or more hard disks, floppy disks, ZIP disks, compact disks (e.g., CD-ROM), digital versatile/video disks (DVD), magnetic random access memory (MRAM) devices, and other system-readable media that store instructions and/or data,

and further explains that memory

may store program modules such as routines, programs objects, images, data structures, program data, and other program modules that perform particular tasks or implement particular abstract data types that facilitate system use.”

Applicant submits that, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, this description of memory in the specification, among others, supports the limitation “electronically accessible medium.” Nevertheless, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended Claims 25-30 to recite “computer-readable medium.”

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has maintained the previous rejection of Claims 1, 10-12, 14-15, 18-20, 23-25, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

6,356,931 issued to Ismael et al. (Ismael). In particular, the Examiner has maintained his position that Ismael teaches a network that has a cluster architecture citing Ismael, Col. 3, Lines 40-53). Applicant disagrees. Nevertheless, in order to advance the prosecution of this application Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, 20 and 25 to clarify and more particularly point out the claimed subject matter of the invention. Claim 1 as currently amended now recites:

1. A computer-implemented method employed within a network having a cluster architecture, comprising:

displaying a representation of a plurality of management beans (MBeans) registered with an MBean server on a graphical user interface of a computing device, wherein each of the displayed MBeans represents a manageable resource within a cluster of application servers *having a group of server nodes and a dispatcher, the application servers in communication with a central service having a locking service and a messaging service;*

selecting one of the plurality of MBeans displayed in the graphical user interface; and

accessing an attribute of the selected MBean with the graphical user interface.

In rejecting the Applicant's previously presented argument that Ismael merely discloses a network of nodes and defines a managed object as merely a software abstraction of a resource that is controlled and monitored by an agent, the Examiner argues that the term "cluster architecture" is not defined in the Applicant's disclosure, but only an example cluster architecture is illustrated. (Office Action of 7-16-2007, Page 8) The Examiner concludes, therefore, that the term "cluster architecture" is broadly defined as "a plurality of computers inter-connected and grouped together in a network."

In response, Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to Figure 12 and the accompanying description appearing in paragraphs [00071] – [00077] on pages 32 -34 of the specification. Figure 12 and the accompanying description support the Applicant's position that Ismael does not disclose a cluster architecture as that term is defined in the application. Applicant has further amended independent claims 1, 15, 20, 25 to clarify the term "cluster of application servers" as recited within the context of "cluster architecture" as that term is defined in the application. Support for the amendments is found in Figure 12 and paragraphs {00071} – [00077] and elsewhere throughout the specification. Accordingly, Claim 1 now recites that the displayed MBeans represents a manageable resource within a cluster of application servers having a group of server nodes and a dispatcher, the application servers in communication with a central service having a locking service and a messaging service. Applicant submits that Ismael fails to teach or disclose that displayed management beans represent a manageable resource within a cluster of application servers having a group of server nodes and a dispatcher, the application servers in communication with a central service having a locking service and a messaging service, as now recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 15, 20 and 25 similarly recite displayed management beans representing a manageable resource within a cluster of application servers having a group of server nodes and a dispatcher, the application servers in communication with a central service having a locking service and a messaging service. Claims 9-12, 14, 18-19, 23-24, 29 and 30 depend from claims 1, 15, 20 and 25, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons claim 1 is not anticipated, Applicant submits claims 10-12, 14-15, 18-20, 23-25, 29 and 30 are not anticipated by Ismael.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has further maintained the rejections of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ismael in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,086,065 issued to Yeluripati et al. (Yeluripati), and Claims 3-9, 17, 22, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ismael in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0112044 to Hessmer et al. (Hessmer). But neither Yeluripati or Hessmer cure the deficiencies of Ismael for the same reasons that Applicant has previously presented. Applicant submits that Claims 3-9, 13, 17, 22, 27 and 28 are allowable, at least in part, because they depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 15, 20 and 25, and because of their additional limitations.

CLAIMS 20-24 – 35 U.S.C. § 112, Sixth Paragraph

The Examiner previously noted that 35 U.S.C. §112, Sixth Paragraph has not been invoked for Claims 20-24 even though means plus function language has been used, arguing that the claim language has been modified by sufficient structure or material (a graphical user interface). Applicant has amended the claims to remove the references to the graphical user interface. Applicant requests, therefore, that Claims 20-24 be interpreted under 35 U.S.C. §112, Sixth Paragraph.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 3-15, 17-20, 21-25 and 27-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: October 16, 2007

/Donna Jo Coningsby/
Donna Jo Coningsby
Reg. No. 41,684
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073